DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 964 PS 013 453

AUTHOR Pellegrini, A. D.
TITLE The Effect of Dramatic Play on Children's Generation of Cohesive Text.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-14, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Language; Discussion; *Dramatic Play; *Elementary School Students; Freehand Drawing; *Kindergarten Children; Oral Language; Primary Education; *Recall (Psychology); Story Telling; *Verbal Ability

ABSTRACT

The extent to which children's cohesive oral text varied as a function of listener status and the extent to which children could be trained to generate decontextualized oral text was examined in a study of children in kindergarten through second grade. Independent variables were children's age; exposure to a play, discussion, or drawing condition; and the naive or informed status of the audience to which a story was retold. The dependent measure consisted of individual children's oral texts, generated on a recall task. Recall was scored for cohesion according to endophoric or exophoric reference and ellipsis. Endophorics are defined as linguistically encoded ties between the presupposed element and the presupposing element (e.g., "John's here. He'll leave later."). Exophorics rely on context or unencoded assumptions to convey meaning (e.g., the statement "It's nice," when "it" is defined by the speaker's pointing to an object). Reference is composed of three subcategories: pronominals, demonstratives, and comparatives. Ellipsis is also composed of three subcategories: nominal, verbal, and causal ellipsis. Children assigned to same-age groups of four were read children's books on three occasions. Following the readings, subjects were exposed to their respective treatments, then were asked to retell the story to a naive or informed listener. Results supported the proposition that children's register is affected by participants in discourse. Additionally, dramatic play appeared to be a context within which children learn to put meaning into words. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED227964

The effect of dramatic play on children's generation of cohesive text [1].

A.D. Pellegrini
Early Childhood Education and
Institute for Behavioral Research
Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A.D. Pellegrini
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running head: Cohesion: K-2

PS013453

1. I would like to acknowledge the following people for their help with the study: Lee Galda, for her help with data collection and coding; and Jack Hayes, Chris Pappas, and Don Rubin for their critical readings of the manuscript. This research was supported by a UGA Faculty Research Grant.

Abstract

The intent of the study was twofold: to examine the extent to which children's cohesive oral text varied as a function of listener status and to determine the extent that children could be trained to generate decontextualized oral text. One hundred and eight children, in same age groups of four, ranging in age from 5; 11 to 8; 1, were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: dramatic play, discussion, or drawing. An adult read each group children's books on three separate occassions. Children were then exposed to their respective treatments and subsequently asked to retell the story to a naive or informed listener. Results indicated that children, independent of age or condition, generated more exophora to an informed listener than to a naive listener and more endophora to a naive than to an informed listener. First and second grade children in the play condition generated more endophora than both of the other groups. The discussion group generated more exophoric ellipsis than kindergarten players. It was suggested that the symbolic nature of play trained children to use explicit language.

The general intent of this investigation was twofold: to examine the extent to which one aspect of children's oral language was sensitive to listener's status and to determine the extent that children's use of decontextualized oral language could be facilitated. The aspect of oral language examined was cohesive oral text, as outlined by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

Speakers generate text to convey meaning. The form of the text, however, varies according to a number of discourse related factors: participants, the situation, the subject matter, and the mode of discourse (Hasan, 1973). Variations in the structure of texts associated with these factors are called registers (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Hasan, 1973; DeStefano, 1972). For example, register will vary according to the social distance between interlocutors (participants). Where there is great social distance between interlocutors, because they do not share common experiences, the register would likely be characterized by lexicalized meaning. That is, meaning is conveyed by encoding ideas into words, by relying minimumly on a body of previously shared knowledge or contextual cues to convey meaning. This register is characterized by endophoric ties within the text, e.g., John's home. He's in his room. In such texts the presupposed element of meaning, John, and the presupposing element, he, are both lexicalized. A text conveying meaning endophorically is cohesive. Conversely, the register characteristic of speakers sharing many common assumptions conveys meaning contextually and is characterized by a greater incedence of exophora; e.g., Hand it over, where the meaning of it is conveyed by a jesture. In order for meaning to be conveyed in such instances, the listener must have access to information other than that which is encoded in the text. In the example

just cited, the listener must be able to see the speaker's jesture. Hasan (Note 1) labels this type of presupposition as exophoric restricted. It is judged to be the most implicit form of conveying meaning textually.

Registers which are characterized by a predominance of exophora are not inherently better than registers characterized by endophora. Registers are more or less appropriate according to the situational contingencies. The appropriateness of a register is determined by those factors previously outlined as influencing registers. An endophora dominated register would be inappropriate in a situation where a great deal of knowledge is shared between interlocutors, e.g., two lovers. Conversely, in a formal setting, where children (participants) in a school setting (situation) are retelling a story (mode and medium) for the teacher (participant), the students' register should be marked by lexicalized meaning; that is, by a predominance of endophora. Hasan (Note 1) suggests using the continuum from exophora to endophora to judge the extent to which speakers lexicalize meaning. More specifically, she suggests using the only two elements of cohesion, i.e., reference and ellipsis, which can be judged exophoric or endophoric, to determine speakers' ability to lexicalize meaning in appropriate situations. Lexicalized text is characterized by a predominance of endophora.

In the present study one factor affecting register was manipulated in the criterion phase of the experiment; all other factors remained constant. That is, all children narrated (mode), orally (medium), the same story (subject matter) in an instructional setting (situation). The factor participants was experimentally manipulated to the extent that half the children narrated the story to the adult who read it to them (the in-

formed listener) and the other half of the children narrated it to an adult who did not hear the story (the naive listener). Thus, the amount of information about the story shared between participants varied. It was hypothesized that the register to each listener would vary according to the amount of shared information. Exophora should characterize the register to the informed listener, rather than the register to naive listeners. Similarly, the register to the naive listener should be marked by endophora.

In school settings, however, children are typically expected to use explicit language despite the amount of shared information between interlocutors (Cook-Gumperz, 1977; DeStefano, in press). Cook-Gumperz (1977) has stated that part of children's socialization into school is for them to learn to lexicalize meaning; even shared meanings should be lexicalized. The reason for this stress on lexicalized meaning is fairly straightforward. In order to become literate, a primary goal of schooling, children must learn to produce and comprehend linguistically conveyed meaning; these abilities are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for writing and reading, respectively. Given the importance of the ability to use explicit language, it seems paramount for educators to design pedagogical techniques for developing this skill.

Dramatic play, as defined by Smilansky (1968, 1971), may be such a technique. In a recent observational study, Pellegrini (1982) found that when young children engaged in dramatic play they generated a predominance of endophora. Children introduced play themes with topic introductory utterances and made repeated reference to them throughout the play episodes. It was argued that dramatic play elicited explicit language because of its symbolic nature. That is, play roles and props had different functions in

play than they had in real life. As a result, players had to define verbally these symbolic transformations to make their meaning clear to other children. Where listeners did not understand the play elicitations the initators had to clarify the topic. These clarifications usually took the form of initators further lexicalizing their intents, e.g., You be the father. For these reasons it was hypothesized that training children in dramatic play would result in their improving their ability to generate a cohesive narrative about stories they enacted.

Having children merely discuss the story with the adult who read them the story would provide practice in talking about the story and recalling facts about the story but not at using explicit language. The symbolic factors of dramatic play, i.e., transforming roles and props, provides children with practice in lexicalizing meaning (Pellegrini & Galda, 1982).

Method

Subjects

The 108 children, fifty four boys and fifty four girls, involved in this study all attended a school in rural Northeast Georgia and were part of an on-going project (Pellegrini & Galda, 1982). The sample was randomly selected from all children in the school in grades K, 1, and 2. The mean ages, in months, for children in grades K, 1, and 2 were: 71.472 (SD = 3.613); 87.361 (SD = 4.911); 96.611 (SD= 2.588), respectively. Within each grade, nine groups of four children were formed by random assignment; each group consisted of two boys and two girls from the same grade. Three groups within each grade were randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions; social dramatic play, discussion, or drawing.

Design and Measures

The design for the study was a 3 (grades: K, 1, 2) x 3 (conditions: play, discussion, drawing) x 2 (listener status: informed, naive) factorial design. The dependent measure was individual children's oral texts generated on a recall task. Recalls were scored for cohesion (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) according to exophoric/endophoric reference and ellipsis. Endophorics are linguistically encoded ties between the presupposed element and the presupposing element, e.g., John's here. He'll leave later. Exophorics rely on context or unencoded assumptions to convey meaning. For example, It's nice, where it is defined by the speaker pointing to an object. Reference is composed of three subcategories: pronominals,

demonstratives, and comparatives. Ellipsis is also composed of three subcategories: nominal, verbal, and clausal ellipses. More thorough descriptions of reference and ellipsis are available in Halliday and Hasan (1976).

Inter-rater agreement for the coding of cohesion was established first by having the author code all utterances. A second coder chose, randomly, five subjects' transcripts from each grade and re-coded them. The percent of agreement was 94% for reference and 88% for ellipsis.

The treatment conditions

There were three treatment conditions: dramatic play, discussion and drawing. After children in the dramatic play condition heard each story the experimenter assigned each of them a role from the story. The children were told: I would like you to play about the story you have just heard. The experimenter had a play role in each play session so as to facilitate children's play. The experimenters' role in the first story, Billy Goats, was a fourth goat and in the second story, The Three Bears, a fourth bear. In Red Cap, the criterion phase, experimenters played Red Cap's mother. In each dramatic play episode, the experimenter helped children to meet Smilansky's (1968) criteria for dramatic play. The criteria were: imitative role play, make-believe in regard to objects, make-believe in regard to action, persistence, social interaction, and verbal communication. The method by which experimenters facilitated dramatic play was again taken from Smilansky (1971). In this model teachers entered the play arena as players taking play roles, not as teachers. They intervened through their appropriate play roles only when the above noted criteria were not being met. For example, if children were not meeting the criterion of make-believe

in regard to objects, the experimenter in the role of Red Cap's mother, would hand Red Cap an imaginary food basket saying: Here's the food basket for Grandmother. Smilansky (1971) has shown that children typically react to the adult play models by incorporating the missing elements into play episodes. All play episodes were videotaped.

Children in the discussion condition, after being read each book, were asked evaluative and clarifications discussion questions by the experimenter about the books, i.e., Do you like the story? What about the story did you like? What was your favorite part? Why? Who in the story was your favorite? Why? All discussions were audiotaped.

Children in the drawing condition were told by the experimenter after they heard the stories, to Draw as much about the story as you can. Children were given crayons and blank paper.

Procedure

Individual groups of four children, same grade and same condition, were taken to an experimental playroom in their school by an experimenter. One male and one female experimenter were randomly assigned to sessions. The playroom was equipped with videotaping equipment. Each group of children was taken to the playroom for three separate sessions. During each session an experimenter read the group a different book and exposed them to their appropriate training conditions. The books read to the children in sessions one through three were: The Three Billy Goats Gruff, The Three Bears, and Little Red Cap, respectively. After the experimenter read each book to the children they were exposed to their respective treatment conditions: play, discussion, or drawing. Each session of reading and training lasted approximately thirty minutes.

Individual children were asked to re-tell the story to an experimenter. One half of the children retold the story to the experimenter who read them the story, i.e., a familiar listener. The other half of the children retold the story to the other experimenter, i.e., a naive listener. Experimenters' roles were randomly counterbalanced. The familiar listener told children: I just read you a story. Tell me as much of the story as you can remember. The naive listener told children: You just heard a story. I didn't hear that story. Tell me as much of the story as you can remember. Children's retellings were recorded on a Sony portable audiorecorder and transcribed by two graduate students.

Children's responses to the Little Red Cap book was the criterion phase of the experiment. That is, only retellings relating to Little Red Cap were analyzed. Reading the children The Three Billy Goats Gruff and The Three Bears, exposing children to their respective conditions, and having them retell the story were used as part of the training conditions.

Results

The effects of grade x condition x listener status on the generation of text are presented in this section. Data were subjected to 3 (grade: K, 1, and 2) x (condition: play, discussion, and control) x 2 (listener: informed and naive) analyses of variance. Newman-Keuls analyses (Winer, 1962), preset at the .05 level, were used for multiple comparisons on main effects. Simple effects (Winer, 1962) were used to examine significant interactions. The summary statistics are presented in table 1.

(Insert table 1 here)

The data were analyzed in the following sequence: first, the effects of grade, condition, and listener on all exophora were examined; then on all endophora. Within the general classes of exophora and endophora, reference and ellipsis were analyzed separately.

Analysis of exophora detected a significant main effect for listener status, F (1) = 14.950, p <.0001, with significantly more exophora given to the informed ($\bar{x}$ = 9.15) than to the naive ($\bar{x}$ = 4.53) listener.

Analysis of endophora detected significant main effects for listener, F (1) = 8.401, p <.005, and condition, F (2) = 8.508, p <.0001, as well as a significant grade x condition interaction, F (4) = 3.046, p <.02. More endophora was observed with naive ($\bar{x}$ = 21.75) than with informed ($\bar{x}$ = 12.42) listeners. Simple effects analysis of the grade x condition interaction revealed no significant differences between conditions at kindergarten. First and second graders in the play condition ($\bar{x}_{1st}$=30.92; $\bar{x}_{2nd}$=34.25) used significantly more endophora than children in both discussion ($\bar{x}_{1st}$=6.58; $\bar{x}_{2nd}$= 19.17) and drawing ($\bar{x}_{1st}$= 9.50; $\bar{x}_{2nd}$= 12.33) groups.

Within the class of exophora, reference and ellipsis were analyzed separately. For exophoric reference, a significant main effect for listener was observed, F (1) = 8.38, p <.004 with more being given to informed ($\bar{x}$ = 6.040) than to naive ($\bar{x}$ = 3.398) listeners. For exophoric ellipsis, there were significant main effects for listener, F (1) = 15.28, p <.0002, and condition, F (2) = 8.20, p <.0005, as well as a significant grade x condition interaction F (4) = .374, p <.007. Significantly more exophoric ellipses were given to informed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.966) than to naive listeners ($\bar{x}$ = 1.23). There was also a main effect for condition at kindergarten with discussants ($\bar{x}$ = 4.828) generating more exophoric ellipses than players ($\bar{x}$ = 2.177).

Within the class endophora, reference and ellipsis were examined again. For endophoric reference, significant main effects for condition, F (2) = 7.43, p <.001, and listener, F (1) = 7.59, p <.007, as well as a significant grade x condition interaction, F (4) = 2.86, p <.02, were observed. More endophoric references were given to naive ($\bar{x}$ = 19.281) than to informed ($\bar{x}$ = 11.437) listeners. There were significant condition effects at first and second graders. For first grade, players ($\bar{x}$ = 28.166) gave significantly more endophoric references than both discussants ($\bar{x}$ = 6.083) and drawers ($\bar{x}$ = 8.416). For grade two, players ($\bar{x}$ = 29.80) generated significantly more endophoric reference than both the drawing ($\bar{x}$ = 11.50) and discussion ($\bar{x}$ = 17.92) groups.

For endophoric ellipsis results were similar to the results for endophoric reference. There were significant main effects for condition, F (2) = 54.466, p <.0006, and listener, F (1) = 20.42., p <.01, and a significant grade x condition interaction, F (4) = 34.987, p <.04. Significantly more endophoric ellipses were given to naive ($\bar{x}$ = 2.060) than to informed ($\bar{x}$ = .500) listeners. There were significant effects for condition only at first and second grades. First grade players ($\bar{x}$ = 2.333) gave significantly more endophoric ellipses than discussants ($\bar{x}$ = 1.08). Second grader players ($\bar{x}$ = 3.87) gave significantly more endophoric ellipses than both discussants ($\bar{x}$ = 1.25) and drawing children ($\bar{x}$ = .833).

Discussion

The results of this experiment support the proposition that children's register is affected by the participants in the discourse. Children, at least as young as six years, were able to judge their listeners background knowledge on a specific topic and use more exophora to listeners who shared with them a specific body of knowledge, i.e., informed listeners, than they did with listeners with whom they did not share the background knowledge, i.e., naive listeners. Their language to naive listeners conveyed meaning lexically, whereas they conveyed meaning to informed listeners by relying more on shared assumptions.

The ability to lexicalize meaning, as measured by a predominance of endophora, can be improved by having children engage in dramatic play on the topic they are to talk about. The analyses of all endophora, and its subcategories, suggested that first and second graders engaging in dramatic play lexicalize meaning about a story more frequently than do children discussing stories with an adult or children drawing pictures about stories. These results extend previous observational research (Pellegrini, 1982) which suggested that dramatic play related to preschoolers' ability to generate cohesive text. The remainder of this section will outline the reasons for the effectiveness of dramatic play, compared to discussion and drawing, as a facilitator of children's use of lexicalized meaning.

The three conditions in this study differed in terms of the linguistic and social experiences they afforded children. Children's registers varied systematically , in turn, because of these variations. This finding is

based on Hasan's (1973) notion that register is correlated with one's social role experiences. That is, a speaker's repertorie of registers is related to the number of different social roles he/she has experienced; the more roles experienced the wider the repertoire of registers. In terms of the lexicalized meaning register, the child exposed to many different roles should verbally encode his/her meaning. The child with restricted role experiences more frequently attempts to convey meaning by shared assumptions and contextual cues.

Children in the drawing condition did not interact with others, verbally or socially, about the books they were read, so it is not surprising that their retellings were less endophoric than the retellings of other children. Children in the drawing condition did not verbally reconstruct the story or enact different story roles. However, it is surprising that the retellings of children who discussed the book with adults were not significantly different from the retellings of the children in the drawing conditions. The reason for this seems to be that in the discussion condition children responded to the experimenters' questions. Responses to those questions, and to questions in general, are usually linguistically tied to the questions; that is, the questions themselves contain presupposed information for the responder and they only encode their responses. As a result, in this training condition children were not constructing cohesive text themselves; the questioner encoded the presupposed information and the children encoded only their responses. the presupposing information. This explanation is supported in light of other findings in this study; kindergarten discussants generated significantly more exophoric ellipsis than players. The predominance of exophoric ellipsis in this condition may be the reason for

the lack of significant difference between the discussion and drawing conditions. Dissussants only encoded the answers to questions; they did not encode the questions and the answers. The linguistic experience provided to children in the discussion condition resulted in their generating more exophoric story retelling than players' retellings.

Discussants' limited social role enactment also may have been responsible for their exophoric retellings. Their social role enactments were limited to the extent that they were not asked to view the story from a perspective other than their own. They were asked only what they thought of the story. Where children experience a limited, or restricted, number of social roles their ability to see the story from different perspectives is limited. Children with such restricted experiences often convey meaning from a personal perspective. Exophora marks stories generaged from this perspective (Bernstein, 1971). Being exposed to a number of different roles helps children realize that different types of people have different assumptions. In order to avoid ambiguity they realize that assumptions must be lexicalized (Bernstein, 1971; hasan, 1973).

On the other hand, players enacted a number of different roles in the different play episodes. Also, within each play episode they were exposed to other players' interpretations of an episode. For example, children's opinion of the props to use for flowers varied. Similarily, children often disagreed on a child's interpretation of a character. Players had to negotiate with each other a concensus interpretation so that play could be sustained. These conflicts and their resolutions resulted in each player discussing a number of different interpretations of the story. As a result, players' shared

assumptions about the story were explicated. A concensus play theme was arrived at only after various interpretations were negotiated verbally among players. Thus, the shared background knowledge about the story roles and props was explicitly encoded before the play episodes could be successfully initiated and sustained.

There were other assumptions in the play condition which had to be made explicit verbally by players. Play roles and play props were symbolic in this condition; that is, the real functions/roles of objects and children were different in play than they were in everyday life. Because of these symbolic transformations there was always the possibility of ambiguity developing between players, so players had to define explicitly the function of play objects to avoid that ambiguity. Thus, the lack of correspondence between real life roles/functions and play roles/functions necessitated the use of lexicalized meaning. If a prop's fantasy meaning was not defined explicitly, its meaning probably would have been ambiguous to other children. Props' fantasy meanings could not have been conveyed contextually, or conveyed through implicit assumption, because these fantasy definitions were often idiosyncratic, e.g., a child defines a crumpled-up piece of paper as a flower. In order for these idiosyncratic definitions to become socially defined they had to be verbally defined with explicit language.

To conclude, dramatic play appears to be a context within which children learn to lexicalize meaning. In this context children negotiating different roles and symbolic transformations gain practice at lexicalizing meaning.

Reference Note

1. Hasan, R. Ways of saying: Ways of meaning. unpublished manuscript.

References

Bernstein, B. Class, codes, and control, Vol. I. London: Routledge & Legan Paul, 1971.

Cook-Gumperz, J. Situated instructions: Language socialization of school age children. In S. Ervin-Tripp, & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.) Child discourse. New York: Academic, 1977.

DeStefano, J. Some parameters of register in adult and child speech. ITL, 18, 1972, 31-45.

DeStefano, J. Learning to communicate in the classroom. In A. Pellegrini & T. Yawkey (Eds.) The development of oral and written language in social contexts. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, in press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. Cohesion in English. London: Longman, 1976.

Hasan, R. Code, register, and social dialect. In B. Bernstein (Ed.) Class, codes, and control, Vol. 2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Pellegrini, A. The construction of text by preschoolers in two play contexts. Discourse Processes, 1982, 5, 101-108.

Pellegrini, A., & Galda, L. The effects of thematic-fantasy play training on the development of children's story comprehension. American Educational Research Journal, 1982, 19, in press.

Smilansky, S. The effects of sociodramatic play on disadvantaged preschool children. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Smilansky, S. Can adults facilitate play in children? In N. Curry, & S. Arnaud (Eds.) Play. Washington, D.C.: NAEYC, 1971.

Winer, B. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EXOPHORIC AND ENDOPHORIC* REFERENCE AND ELLIPSIS
BY GRADE BY CONDITION BY LISTENER STATUS**

	PLAY		DISCUSSION		CONTROL	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
KINDERGARTEN						
Pro X	1.200(2.888)	1.788(3.018)	2.200(3.714)	3.830(4.191)	0(1.250)	0(.957
Pro N	5.400(5.333)	3.361(6.576)	11.600(5.714)	10.737(9.178)	14.000(1.250)	16.970(1.50)
Dem X	1.000(3.445)	1.000(4.475)	3.800(3.857)	4.816(3.387)	1.500(3.0)	1.378(2.943)
Dem N	6.600(2.444)	5.727(4.419)	5.800(3.142)	9.679(3.338)	7.833(1.250)	11.703(1.258)
Comp X	1.200(.444)	1.643(1.013)	.400(.857)	.894(1.864)	0(.750)	0(1.50)
Comp N	3.000(.556)	6.164(1.660)	.200(1.428)	.447(2.609)	.500(0)	1.224(0)
Nom X	1.600(1.889)	1.816(2.472)	.600(2.857)	.547(2.267)	0(3.250)	0(2.217
Nom N	2.600(.111)	1.816(.333)	1.200(.856)	1.095(1.573)	1.333(.250)	2.065(.500)
Verb X	.200(.111)	.447(.333)	1.800(1.857)	2.387(2.410)	.666(1.750)	1.211(2.217)
Verb N	.200(.111)	.447(.333)	.600(.428)	.894(.786)	.667(0)	.816(0)
Cl X	0(.556)	0(1.333)	.400(2.857)	.547(3.436)	.166(3.250)	.408(.500)
Cl N	.200(.111)	.447(.333)	.600(.142)	.893(.377)	0(0)	0(0)

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EXOPHORIC AND ENDOPHORIC* REFERENCE AND ELLIPSIS

BY GRADE BY CONDITION BY LISTENER STATUS**

	PLAY		DISCUSSION		CONTROL	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
First Grade						
Pro X	0(2.5)	0(3.391)	1.500(1.666)	2.708(3.204)	0(1.833)	0(4.490)
Pro N	19.333(.0)	9.709(8.717)	3.00 (2.833)	2.190(2.316)	3.500(5.000)	2.428(2.607)
Dem X	1.666(3.666)	.752(2.581)	.833(3.333)	.983(1.032)	1.333(4.666)	1.505(2.422)
Dem N	18.167(6.666)	9.765(6.801)	3.833(2.333)	3.430(1.211)	4.000(3.000)	5.099(3.464)
Comp X	.333(.666)	.816(1.632)	.166(.166)	.408(.408)	.500(.333)	.836(.816)
Comp N	2.667(1.)	6.531(2.)	.166(0)	.408(0)	1.166(.166)	2.041(.408)
Nom X	.833(1.167)	.408(1.940)	.333(.500)	.516(.547)	.666(1.000)	.816(1.095)
Nom N	2.833(1.)	2.136(1.549)	.333(.166)	.516(.408)	.166(1.000)	.408(2.000)
Verb X	0(.833)	0(.752)	0(.166)	0(.408)	0(.166)	0(.408)
Verb N	.166(.166)	.408(.408)	.166(.333)	.408(.516)	0(.833)	0(1.602)
Cl X	.833(2.5)	.816(2.428)	0(.500)	0(.547)	.166(.666)	.408(1.032)
Cl N	.333(.166)	.816(.408)	0(0)	0(0)	.166(.333)	.408(.516

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EXOPHORIC AND ENDOPHORIC* REFERENCE AND ELLIPSIS

BY GRADE BY CONDITION BY LISTENER STATUS**

	PLAY		DISCUSSION		CONTROL	
Second Grade	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Pro X	.285(1.800)	.487(3.492)	.166(4.800)	.408(5.674)	10.166(.166)	15.930(.408)
Pro N	17.285(13.600)	10.451(11.567)	8.833(10.000)	11.461(8.573)	7.166(4.833)	6.080(6.306)
Dem X	2.000(3.000)	.577(1.414)	2.166(4.200)	1.940(1.303)	3.000(2.333)	2.529(1.505)
Dem N	13.000(11.400)	8.485(5.770)	11.166(6.800)	12.367(4.147)	6.833(3.666)	5.776(4.844)
Comp X	0(0)	0(0)	.166(.600)	.408(1.341)	.333(0)	.816(0)
Comp N	2.714(1.600)	2.563(1.516)	.333(.800)	.816(1.788)	0(.500)	0(1.224)
Nom X	.285(.200)	.487(.447)	.500(1.600)	.547(1.516)	.166(.166)	.408(.408)
Nom N	2.000(2.00)	2.380(2.549)	.500(1.000)	1.224(1.224)	.500(0)	.836(0)
Verb X	1.285(0)	2.563(0)	0(1.200)	0(1.303)	.166(.500)	.408(.836)
Verb N	.857(.200)	1.864(.447)	0(.200)	0(.447)	.333(.166)	.516(.406
Cl X	.285(0)	.755(0)	.166(.600)	.408(.547)	.166(.833)	.408(1.602)
Cl N	1.714(1.400)	1.799(2.607)	.833(.200)	2.041(.447)	.666(0)	1.211(0)

* X = Exophoric N = Endophoric

** Listener 2 in parentheses